

REMARKS

Initially, in the Office Action dated July 29, 2003, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 6-9 and 14-17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,453,353 (Win et al.). Claims 2-5 and 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Win et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,519,587 (Blinn et al.).

By this Amendment, claims 1 and 9 have been amended. Claims 1-17 remain pending in this application.

Examiner LeRoux/Supervisor Metjahic Interviews

Applicants thank both Examiner LeRoux and the Examiner's Supervisor Metjahic for the telephone interviews held on November 25th and 26th, respectively. Applicants further thank Supervisor Metjahic for reviewing the proposed amended claims and stating that these claims would not be entered as they would require further search.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

Claims 1, 6-9 and 14-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Win et al. Win et al. has been discussed in Applicants' previously filed response. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Regarding claims 1 and 9, Applicants submit that Win et al. does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of these claims of, inter alia, means for storing a dispersed-data access privilege, said dispersed-data access privilege being an access privilege to the dispersed data, and correlating dispersed-

data identification information for identifying a first user permitted to access the dispersed data and a dispersed-data operating right indicative of operation contents by which the first user indicated by said dispersed-data identification information is permitted to operate the dispersed data, or means for storing an integrated-data access privilege, said integrated-data access privilege being an access privilege to the integrated data, and correlating integrated-data identification information for identifying a second user or said user processing apparatus permitted to access the integrated data and an integrated-data operating right indicative of operation contents by which the second user or user processing apparatus indicated by said integrated-data identification information is permitted to operate the integrated data, or means for receiving an access request, said access request being an access request for operating the integrated data from said user processing apparatus, and containing user identification information for identifying the second user of the user processing apparatus concerned or the user processing apparatus concerned, or means for receiving a dispersed-data access privilege from each of said plurality of database apparatuses, said dispersed-data access privilege being an access privilege to the dispersed data, and correlating dispersed-data identification information for identifying a first user permitted to access the dispersed data and a dispersed-data operating right indicative of operation contents by which the first user indicated by said dispersed-data identification information is permitted to operate the dispersed data. Win et al. discloses a user name used in determining whether a permit should be given or not is equal to a user name used in determining whether a

resource based on the permit should be restricted. More specifically, with respect to each user or each user name, a correspondence is set between permission or no permission of access to the system (authentication) and a resource available when permitted (or authentic). Such information is stored on a Registry Repository 110. In short, the authentication and the resource are correlated with each other for each user name. If the user name is specified, the authentication and the available resource are determined. This is not correlating dispersed-data identification information for identifying a first user permitted to access the dispersed data and a dispersed-data operating right indicative of operation contents by which the first user indicated by said dispersed-data identification information is permitted to operate the dispersed data, or means for storing an integrated-data access privilege, said integrated-data access privilege being an access privilege to the integrated data, and correlating integrated-data identification information for identifying a second user or said user processing apparatus permitted to access the integrated data and an integrated-data operating right indicative of operation contents by which the second user or user processing apparatus indicated by said integrated-data identification information is permitted to operate the integrated data, as recited in the claims of the present invention. According to present invention, with an assumption that a user or user name using an integrated database and a user or user name using individual databases are entirely different, an integrated database system manages a corresponding relation between access privileges allocated to the different user names. In short, according to the present invention, even if one user name is

determined, access to a dispersed data cannot be determined unless the other user name and the corresponding relation therebetween are determined. Accordingly, one who uses an integrated database can access a dispersed data without taking into consideration an access privilege to individual databases. In addition, an integrated database and individual databases can be developed independently of each other. That is, in the development a user using an integrated database and an access privilege thereof can be freely determined without taking into account a user using individual databases, while an individual database can determine a user and an access privilege thereof within a self system, without having to consider a user using the integrated database. As a result, the time necessary for developing the databases can be reduced. Winn et al. does not disclose or suggest these features of the present invention as recited in the claims of the present application.

Regarding claims 6-8 and 14-17, Applicants submit that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 1 and 9 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted regarding these independent claims. For example, the Examiner asserts that Win et al. discloses limiting the operation indicated by the access request at col. 4, lines 38-40. However, this portion of Win et al. merely discloses that the foregoing components cooperate to control access to resources (dispersed data) stored on one or more protected servers. However, Applicants' control means does not cooperate with other components during access control, but refers to an access privilege to integrated data for judging.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Win et al. does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of claims 1, 6-9 and 14-17 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 2-5 and 10-13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Win et al. in view of Blinn et al. Blinn et al. has been discussed in Applicants' previously filed response. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Applicants submit that claims 2-5 and 10-13 are dependent on one of independent claims 1 and 9 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims. Applicants submit that Blinn et al. does not overcome the substantial defects noted previously regarding Win et al. Accordingly, Applicants submit that neither Win et al. nor Blinn et al., taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 2-5 and 10-13 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-17 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested.

U.S. Application No. 09/803,149

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of Antonelli, Terry, Stout & Kraus, LLP, Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (referencing attorney docket no. 500.39846X00).

Respectfully submitted,

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP



Frederick D. Bailey
Registration No. 42,282

FDB/sdb
(703) 312-6600